rural shortage area characterized by low family income. The regulations set forth in 42 CFR 57.216(b)(1976), as adopted on February 7, 1974 remain applicable to cancellation on this basis. The provisions can be found at 39 FR 4774 (February 7, 1974) and a copy can be obtained by writing to the Division of Manpower Training Support, Bureau of Health Manpower, Center Building, 3700 East-West Highway, Hyattsville, Md. 20782.

§ 57.214 Repayment of loans made after November 17, 1971 for failure to complete a program of study.

In the event that the Secretary undertakes to repay educational loans under section 741(1) of the Act, he will utilize the following criteria in making his determination as to each applicant's eligibility:

(a) An applicant will be considered to have failed to complete the course of study leading to the first professional degree for which an eligible education loan was made upon certification by a health professions school that the individual ceased to be enrolled in the school subsequent to November 17, 1971;

(b) An applicant will be considered to be in exceptionally needy circumstances if, upon comparison of the income and other financial resources of the applicant with his or her expenses and financial obligations, the Secretary determines that repayment of the loan would constitute a serious economic burden on the applicant. In making this determination, the Secretary will take into consideration the net financial assets of the applicant and the relationship of the income available to the applicant to the low-income levels published annually by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section;

(c) An applicant will be considered to be from a low-income family if the applicant comes from a family with an annual income below a level based on low-income thresholds according to family size published by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, adjusted annually for changes in the Consumer Price Index, and adjusted by the Secretary for use in this program, and the family has no substantial net financial assets. Income levels as adjusted will be published annually by the Secretary in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

(d) An applicant will be considered to be from a disadvantaged family if the individual comes from a family in which the annual income minus unusual expenses which contribute to the economic burdens borne by the family does not exceed the low-income levels published by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section and the family has no substantial net financial assets;

(e) An applicant will be considered as not having resumed his or her health professions studies within 2 years following the date the individual ceased to be a student upon a certification so stating from the applicant; and

(f) An applicant will be considered as not reasonably expected to resume his or her health professions studies within 2 years following the date upon which he or she terminated these studies, based upon consideration of the reasons for the applicant's failure to complete these studies, taking into account such factors as academic, medical, or financial difficulties.

The Secretary will only repay education loans made subsequent to November 17, 1971.

§ 57.215 Records, reports, inspection, and audit.

(a) *Records and reports.* (1) Each Federal capital contribution and Federal capital loan is subject to the condition that the school must maintain those records and file with the Secretary those reports relating to the operation of its health professions student loan fund that the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act and these regulations. The school also must comply with the requirements of section 705 of the Act.

(2) The following student records must be retained by the school for 5 years after an individual student has ceased to be a full-time student:

(i) Approved and disapproved student applications for health professions student loans.

(ii) Documentation of the financial need of applicants.

(iii) Reasons for approval or disapproval of applications and;

(iv) Other records as the Secretary may prescribe. Individual student records may be destroyed at the end of the 5-year period, except that in all cases where questions have arisen as a result of a Federal audit, the records will be retained until resolution of all the questions.

(b) *Audit.* Each participating health professions school is responsible for providing and paying for an annual financial audit of its books, accounts, financial records, files, and other papers and property in accordance with the requirements of section 705(b) of the Act. The audit must be conducted by and certified to be accurate by an independent certified public accountant utilizing generally accepted auditing standards. A report of this audit must be filed with the Secretary at the time and in the manner as the Secretary may require.

(c) *Inspection.* Each participating health professions school must make available to the Secretary or the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their authorized representatives all books, documents, papers, and records listed in paragraphs (a) and (b) for examination, copying, or mechanical reproduction, on or off the premises of the grantee upon a reasonable request for them.

§ 57.216 Nondiscrimination.

(a) Participating schools are advised that in addition to complying with the terms and conditions of these regulations, the following laws and regulations are applicable:

(1) Section 704 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 292d) and its implementing regulation, 45 CFR Part 83 (prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in the admission of individuals to training programs).

(2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and its implementing regulation, 45 CFR Part 80 (prohibiting discrimination in federally assisted programs on the grounds of race, color, or national origin).

(3) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) and its implementing regulation, 45 CFR Part 86 (prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in federally assisted education programs).

(4) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, (29 U.S.C. 794) and its implementing regulation, 45 CFR Part 84 (prohibiting discrimination in federally assisted programs on the basis of handicap).

(b) The recipient may not discriminate on the basis of religion in the admission of individuals to its training programs.

§ 57.217 Additional conditions.

The Secretary may with respect to any agreement entered into with any school under § 57.205, impose additional conditions prior to or at the time of any award when in his judgment these conditions are necessary to assure or protect the advancement of the purposes of the agreement, the interest of the public health, or the conservation of funds awarded.

§ 57.218 Noncompliance.

Wherever the Secretary finds that a participating school has failed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Act or the regulations of this subpart, he may, on reasonable notice to the school, withhold further payment of Federal capital contributions, and take such other action, including the termination of any agreement, as he finds necessary to enforce the Act and regulations. In such case no further expenditures shall be made from the health professions student loan fund or funds involved until the Secretary determines that there is no longer any failure of compliance.

[FR Doc. 78-31567 Filed 11-9-78; 8:45 am]

[6712-01-M]

Title 47—Telecommunication

CHAPTER I—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[FCC 78-759]

PART 83—STATIONS ON SHIPBOARD IN THE MARITIME SERVICES

Extending the Date for Compliance

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Order.

SUMMARY: The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) amends its regulations relating to stations on shipboard in the maritime services. The amendment extends for 1 year the requirement for modification of internal timing circuitry within the 500 kHz automatic alarm receiver (radio devices capable of receiving over the air an alarm signal transmitted by a distant ship or shore station). In another proceeding the FCC has proposed the international radio regulations to be amended to reduce the guard band for 500kHz. Implementation of the guard band reduction would necessitate a corresponding modification of the automatic alarm receiver. The 1-year extension, requested by industry, will permit both modifications to be made at the same time.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 13, 1978.

ADDRESS: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Walter E. Weaver, Safety and Special Radio Services Bureau, 202-632-7197.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the matter of amendment of part 83 to extend the date for compliance with the requirements of § 83.554(a)(1)(i).

Adopted: October 24, 1978.

Released: November 2, 1978.

By the Commission:

1. The American Institute of Merchant Shipping (AIMS) and the Central Committee on Telecommunications of the American Petroleum Institute (API) have been requested that the Commission extend the mandatory date of July 1, 1980, appearing in subdivisions (*a*) and (*b*) of section 83.554(a)(1)(i) of the rules. The date of July 1, 1980, applies to the requirements for completion of modifications of internal timing circuitry within the 500 kHz automatic alarm receiver.[1] These requirements were adopted in the proceeding in docket No. 20148.[2]

2. The AIMS and API request results from Commission action in the eighth notice of inquiry in docket No. 20271. In the eighth notice of inquiry the Commission proposed that the international radio regulations be amended to reduce the guard band for 500 kHz from 490-510 kHz to 495-505 kHz. This proposal is one of many proposals developed as a part of the United States preparation for the 1979 World Administrative Radio Conference.[3] The purpose of the proposed amendment is to effect improved efficiency in use of the radio spectrum. AIMS and API point out, correctly, that implementation of this guard band reduction would necessitate a corresponding modification of the 500 kHz automatic alarm receiver.

3. The modifications of the auto alarm receiver required by docket No. 20148 will be implemented by complete replacement of that receiver, in some cases, and by modification in others. Those modifications will be completed at about the time it is necessary to start the modification resulting from reduction of the guard band. Thus, the new auto alarm receivers, installed per docket No. 20148, would have to be removed from aboard ship and modified, or where old receivers were modified, they would have to be again removed and further modified. In view of this duplication, AIMS and API feel, and we agree, that the date of July 1, 1980, in docket No. 20148 should be extended to permit both modifications to be made at the same time.

4. Regarding questions on matters covered by this document contact Walter E. Weaver, 202-632-7197.

5. The amendment adopted herein merely extends for 1 year an exception to certain technical requirements on auto alarms and as such is considered a minor amendment. Hence, the notice and public procedure provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553 are unnecessary. Accordingly, *it is ordered*, That, pursuant to the authority contained in sections 4(i) and 303 (e), (f) and (r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, part 83 of the Commission's rules is amended effective November 13, 1978, as set forth below.

6. *It is further ordered*, That, the Chief, Safety and Special Radio Services Bureau is authorized to determine, on a timely basis, if a further extension, beyond July 1, 1981, is required and to grant a waiver, should he determine that such further extension is required.

(Secs. 4, 303, 48 Stat., as amended, 1066, 1082; 47 U.S.C. 154, 303.)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
WILLIAM J. TRICARICO,
Secretary.

Part 83 of chapter I of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 83—STATIONS ON SHIPBOARD IN THE MARITIME SERVICES

In § 83.554(a)(1)(i), subdivisions (*a*) and (*b*) are amended to read as follows:

§ 83.554 Requirements for radiotelegraph auto alarm.

(a) * * *

(1) *Basic technical requirements.*

(i) * * *

(*a*) Auto alarms of the nondigital type employing resistance-capacitance timing covered by type approval granted before October 1, 1969, and placed in service on or before January 1, 1975, need only satisfy the following less stringent rejection limits: The auto alarm shall not respond to dashed longer than 7.40 seconds or shorter than 2.80 seconds, nor to spaces longer than 1.80 seconds or shorter than 5 milliseconds.[1] This exception shall not continue in effect after July 1, 1981.

(*b*) Auto alarms of the digital type employing a stable clock as the basic timing device covered by type approval granted before May 1, 1968, and placed in service on or before December 1, 1975, may be permitted additionally to accept dashes whose lower limit extends beyond 3.33 seconds down to 3.0 seconds.[1] This exception shall not continue in effect after July 1, 1981. Auto alarms installed before * * * (the effective date of this report and order), shall demonstrate compliance with this subsection during their first detailed annual inspection subsequent to that date.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 78-31817 Filed 11-9-78; 8:45 am]

[1] These are radio devices, usually unattended, which are capable of receiving over the air an alarm signal transmitted by a distant ship or shore station; they are designed to respond to the signal by actuating an alerting device such as a bell at a location where a watch stander is present. The alarm signal is a radio wave made up, ideally, of 12 4-second dashes separated from each other by 1-second spaces.

[2] The report and order was released May 1, 1975; FCC 75-442; 52 FCC 2d818; 40 FR 19644.

[3] To be convened in Geneva late in 1979 by the International Telecommunication Union.

[1] The acceptability of an auto alarm during field inspection under the limits specified in this exception will be determined in the absence of interference of any kind.

[4910-50-M]

Title 49—Transportation

CHAPTER V—NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket No. 74-14; Notice 14]

PART 571—FEDERAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

Occupant Restraint Systems

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to amend Safety Standard No. 208, Occupant Crash Protection, to provide for the optional use by motor vehicle manufacturers of alternatives to latches for releasing occupants from passive seatbelt systems in emergencies and to allow means other than pushbuttons to operate the emergency release mechanisms of passive belt systems. The amendment is based on a proposal issued in response to a petition from General Motors Corp. to allow manufacturers greater latitude in designing emergency release mechanisms for passive belt systems. The amendment will allow manufacturers to experiment with various emergency release mechanisms aimed at encouraging passive belt use by motorists, prior to the effective date of passive restraint requirements specified in this standard.

DATE: Effective date: November 13, 1978.

ADDRESS: Petitions for reconsideration should refer to the docket number and notice number and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5108, Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Guy Hunter, Office of Vehicle Safety Standards, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Washington, D.C. 20590, 202-426-2265.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Safety Standard No. 208, 49 CFR 571.208, currently specifies that a seatbelt assembly installed in a passenger car shall have a latch mechanism that releases at a single point by pushbutton action. General Motors petitioned for relief from this requirement for passive belts, following the issuance of the final rule requiring passenger cars to be equipped with passive restraints (air bags, passive belts, or other means of passive, i.e., automatic, protection) (42 FR 34289; July 5, 1977). The petition described a "spool release" design General Motors would like to use on one of its passive belt systems. The system would include a shoulder belt that would not detach at either end. Rather, the design would allow the belt to "play out" or unwind from the retractor in an emergency, allowing sufficient slack for the door to be opened and the occupant to exit from the vehicle. The purpose of such a "spool release" design is to minimize the disconnection of the passive belt system by motorists. Under the current latch mechanism and pushbutton requirements for belts, a passive belt system could be easily disconnected by a buckle release identical to buckles on current active belt systems (i.e., belts that motorists must manually put into place). As long as the belt remains disconnected, the "passivity" of the system would be destroyed for future use.

In response to the GM petition, the NHTSA issued a proposal to amend standard 208 to allow alternative release mechanisms for passive belts (43 FR 21912, May 22, 1978). As noted in that proposal, the NHTSA is very concerned about the usage rate of passive belts by motorists since it appears that there may be many new cars in the 1980's equipped with these systems. If motorists who would prefer air bags in a particular car line can only obtain passive belts from the manufacturer the defeat rate of the belts could be high. The agency is, therefore, interested in fostering any passive belt design that is effective and that minimizes the rate of disconnection. The notice pointed out, however, that there are other factors to be considered in the proposed change.

The original purpose of the latch mechanism and pushbutton requirements of standard 208 was to insure uniformity of buckle design for the purpose of facilitating routine fastening and unfastening of active belts, encouraging belt use by making the belts as convenient as possible and facilitating the exiting of vehicle occupants in emergency situations. Since the proposed amendment would allow various types of release mechanisms, the agency was concerned that the resulting nonuniformity might have adverse consequences in emergency egress situations from passive belts. In order to examine the implications of the General Motors petition thoroughly, the proposal sought public comments on four specific questions concerning the efficacy and advisability of allowing alternative release mechanisms to latches for passive belt systems. The four questions were as follows:

1. "How should the NHTSA or the vehicle manufacturers monitor the efficacy of and public reaction to various systems for discouraging disconnection of passive belts (such as the latch mechanism with a 4-8 second audible/visible warning system that operates if the belt is not connected when the ignition is turned on, a latch mechanism with additional warning or interlock systems voluntarily installed by a vehicle manufacturer, or a lever operated spool release as requested by General Motors)?"

2. "Are there safety or other considerations that would make it inadvisable to allow the spool release at this time as an option to vehicle manufacturers which install passive belts?"

3. "Compared with a passive belt system equipped with the currently-required latch mechanism, would a passive belt system equipped with a spool release whose actuation lever is located between the seats have substantial disadvantages for emergency exit or extraction from a vehicle that would offset any possible increase in usage in the passive belts?"

4. "If the NHTSA decides to permit the use of alternative occupant release mechanisms, should such use be permitted indefinitely or only for a finite period, e.g., several years, to allow field testing of the various systems? If a finite period were to be established, when should it begin and end?"

All 15 comments to the May 22, 1978, notice supported the intent of the proposed change to allow alternative release mechanisms for passive belts. Most commenters agreed that a nonseparable passive belt should discourage disconnection by motorists and that this should be given higher priority consideration than possible adverse effects such a belt might have on emergency occupant egress. Volkswagen did express some concern that the benefits achieved by increased belt usage might be somewhat offset if problems with emergency exiting arise, but agreed that more flexibility in passive belt design should be allowed to encourage belt use.

Volkswagen urged the use of the passive belt system utilized on its Deluxe Rabbit—a pushbutton release latch mechanism guarded by an ignition interlock. The company stated that this type system is simple and works well in emergency situations regardless of the condition of the retractor or the positioning of the webbing (potential problems of a "spool release" type design). Volkswagen pointed out that a system that is too complex will require close monitoring to insure effectiveness.

While the Volkswagen system has shown high use rates in the field, there is a possibility that widespread use of this type system could lead to adverse public reaction because of the interlock feature. As pointed out by the Alliance of American Insurers in its support of the proposed amendment, there could be a second public "backlash" from a return to the use of starter interlocks, even if placed on the vehicle voluntarily by the manufacturer. Alliance stated that the "spool release" system proposed by

General Motors should be preferable to the interlock from a public acceptance standpoint.

The Center for Auto Safety and the Prudential Property & Casualty Insurance Co. both commented that "spool release" type mechanisms should be self-restoring to insure that in subsequent uses of the vehicle the passive belt is ready to provide the automatic protection for which it was designed. The self-restoring feature would automatically retract the belt after the manual release has been activated to allow the belt to "play-out." The NHTSA believes that both self-restoring "spool release" designs and manual restoration designs have distinct advantages. The automatic restoration does not require the vehicle user to have any knowledge of the system to reactivate the passive belt. However, a manual restoration design would be less complex and would probably be more reliable. The manual design could be coupled with audible and visible warnings to indicate when the lockup portion of the retractor is inoperative. The amendment set forth in this notice allows both types of restoration systems for "spool release" passive belt designs.

The majority of commenters argued that the proposed amendment should be effective indefinitely, and not merely during the interim period until the passive restraint requirements become effective. The comments stated that manufacturers should be given the greatest possible design latitude to encourage the early introduction of innovative passive belt systems that are designed to minimize disconnection by motorists. The industry noted that manufacturers will be hesitant to initiate such new programs and passive belt designs if alternative release designs are allowed only for an interim period. Further, the commenters stated that an interim rule would not allow time for an adequate examination of the effectiveness of the various new designs that might be developed. The agency has concluded that these arguments have merit. Accordingly, this amendment is effective indefinitely.

Several comments stated that the new passive belt designs should be standardized, so that the public will understand their use and problems of emergency occupant egress will be minimized. While the agency agrees that uniformity in release design is advantageous, it is not practical to standardize systems that are only in the development stage. Further, if manufacturers are not given latitude in their passive belt designs, the purpose of this amendment would be defeated. It is unclear at this time which passive belt systems will be the most effective in encouraging belt use and at the same time be accepted by the public. The agency will, of course, monitor all new passive belt systems as closely as possible, and efforts to standardize systems could be made in the future.

Ford Motor Co. commented that the revision of standard No. 208 as requested in the General Motors petition would provide greater latitude than presently exists, but that the requested wording is restrictive in that it would inhibit the development of methods of release other than those specifically related to the retractor. Ford requested that the proposed revision include language permitting manufacturers the greatest possible design latitude. The agency emphasized in the previous notice that the proposal was tentative as to the language and substance of an amendment that might be adopted in response to the General Motors petition. Accordingly, this amendment is broader than that proposed in the General Motors petition and does not limit the types of passive belt designs that may be developed.

In order to insure that vehicle occupants are aware if their passive belts are inoperable because a release mechanism has been activated, this amendment specifies that the warning light, "Fasten Belts," remain illuminated until the belt latch mechanism has been fastened or the release mechanism has been deactivated. This warning light of indefinite duration is in addition to the 4- to 8-second audible warning signal currently required by the standard. The agency believes a continuous warning light is essential since this amendment will allow various types of unfamiliar release systems for passive belts.

In summary, the agency has concluded that manufacturers should be given considerable latitude in designing emergency release mechanisms for passive belt systems. This will permit the development of innovative systems aimed at limiting passive belt disconnection by motorists. Otherwise, the use rate of passive belt systems could be as low as the current use rate for active belt systems. This amendment will allow manufacturers to experiment with various passive belt designs before the effective date of the passive restraint requirements and determine which designs are the most effective and at the same time acceptable to the public.

The agency does not believe that the use of alternative release mechanisms will cause serious occupant egress problems if manufacturers take precautions to instruct vehicle owners how the systems work through the owner's manual and through their dealers. While uniformity in release mechanisms is certainly important for purposes of emergency occupant egress, the agency has concluded that this consideration is at least temporarily outweighed by the importance of insuring passive belts are not disconnected. The agency will, however, monitor all new passive belt designs to assure that the release mechanisms are simple to understand and operate. If the methods of operation of the various release mechanisms are self-evident, the problem of lack of uniformity in design will be less important in terms of emergency occupant egress.

The agency has concluded that this amendment will have no adverse economic or environmental impacts.

The engineer and lawyer primarily responsible for the development of this rule are Guy Hunter and Hugh Oates, respectively.

§ 571.208 [Amended]

In consideration of the above, standard No. 208 (49 CFR 571.208) is amended as follows:

1. S7.2 introductory text is revised to read:

S7.2 *Latch mechanism.* A seat belt assembly installed in a passenger car, except a passive belt assembly, shall have a latch mechanism—

2. Paragraph S4.5.3.3(a) is revised to read:

S4.5.3.3(a). Conform to S7.1 and have a single emergency release mechanism whose components are readily accessible to a seated occupant.

3. S4.5.3.3(b) is revised to read:

S4.5.3.3(b). In place of a warning system that conforms to S7.3 of this standard, be equipped with the following warning system:

(1) At the left front designated seating position (driver's position), be equipped with a warning system that activates a continuous or intermittent audible signal for a period of not less than 4 seconds and not more than 8 seconds (beginning when the vehicle ignition switch is moved to the "on" or the "start" position) when condition (A) exists simultaneously with condition (B), and that activates a continuous or flashing warning light, visible to the driver, displaying the words "Fasten Seat Belts" or "Fasten Belts" for as long as condition (A) exists simultaneously with condition (B).

(A) The vehicle's ignition switch is moved to the "on" position or to the "start" position.

(B) The driver's passive belt is not in use, as determined by the belt latch mechanism not being fastened or, if the passive belt is nonseparable, by the emergency release mechanism being in the released position.

(Sec. 103, 119, Pub. L. 89-563, 80 Stat. 718 (15 U.S.C. 1392, 1407), delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.)

Issued on November 1, 1978.

JOAN CLAYBROOK,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 78-31815 Filed 11-7-78; 2:33 am]

[1505-01-M]

Title 14—Aeronautics and Space

CHAPTER I—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

[Docket Nos. 14324, 14606, 14625, 14685, and 14779; Amdt. Nos. 23-23; 25-46; 27-16; 29-17; and 121-149]

AIRWORTHINESS REVIEW PROGRAM AMENDMENT NO. 7

Airframe Amendments; Final Rule

Correction

In FR Doc. 78-30348 appearing at page 50578 in the issue for Monday, October 30, 1978, make the following changes:

(1) On page 50593, middle column, the section heading now reading "§ 23.785 Seats and berths." should have read "§ 23.785 Seats, berths, safety belts, and harnesses."

(2) On page 50594, third column, the formula in § 25.331(c)(2)(i) should have read as follows:

$$\frac{39n}{V}(n-15),\ (\text{Radians/Sec.}^2)$$

where—

n is the positive load factor at the speed under consideration; and
V is the airplane equivalent speed in knots.

(3) In the same section, in paragraph (c)(1)(ii), in the fifth line, "The negative pitching * * *" should have read "This negative pitching * * *," and the formula should have read as follows:

$$\frac{-26n}{V}(n-15),\ (\text{Radians/Sec.}^2)$$

where—

n is the positive load factor at the speed under consideration; and V is the airplane equivalent speed in knots.

(4) On page 50597, in § 25.811, the first paragraph at the top of the center column, the text labeled "(ii)" in the third line should have been set forth as a separate paragraph.

proposed rules

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

[1505-01-M]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

[7 CFR Part 1135]

[Docket No. AO-380]

MILK IN THE SOUTHWESTERN IDAHO-EASTERN OREGON MARKETING AREA

Hearing on Proposed Marketing Agreement and Order

Correction

In FR Doc. 78-29966, appearing at page 49704 in the issue of Tuesday, October 24, 1978, on page 49712 in the third column, in § 1135.73(e), in the 11th line after the word "date" insert "* * * for making payments pursuant to this section following the date * * *."

[3410-07-M]

Farmers Home Administration

[7 CFR Part 1804]

[FmHA Instruction 424.1]

PLANNING AND PERFORMING DEVELOPMENT WORK

Planning and Performing Development Work

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON THERMAL INSULATION STANDARDS

AGENCY: Farmers Home Administration, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture intends to undertake a study of the thermal performance and related economic factors of concrete masonry wall construction in residential structures. This study is in response to the conference report of the House-Senate conference committee on the fiscal year 1979 Agriculture Appropriations Bill which stated:

> In deleting this Amendment, the conferees will expect the Farmers Home Administration to undertake a revision of its standards, based upon available information on the thermal performance aspects of masonry wall construction as agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture in his letter of September 11, 1978. In the course of this study, the Farmers Home Administration should consult with the various construction materials industries, State, local and Federal government agencies, engineering societies, and various code and standards-writing bodies.
>
> Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the conferees will expect the Farmers Home Administration to publish in the FEDERAL REGISTER a proposal for adjustments of the thermal performance standards that are indicated as a result of this study. Such adjustments, if the study so indicates, should be in the form of a separate performance thermal insulation standard for masonry construction.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 1, 1978.

ADDRESS: Submit written comments to the Office of the Chief, Directives Management Branch, Farmers Home Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 6316, Washington, D.C. 20250. All written comments made pursuant to this notice will be available for public inspection at the address given above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Daniel Ball, 202-447-3394.

Dated: November 6, 1978.

JAMES E. THORNTON,
Acting Administrator,
Farmers Home Administration.

[FR Doc. 78-31798 Filed 11-9-78; 8:45 am]

[4910-13-M]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

[14 CFR Parts 71 and 73]

[Airspace Docket No. 78-SW-50]

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF TEMPORARY RESTRICTED AREAS AND ALTERATION OF CONTINENTAL CONTROL AREA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to establish four temporary joint use restricted areas in the vicinity of Fort Hood, Tex., to contain a military joint readiness exercise called Brave Shield 19. These proposed actions would provide for the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by prohibiting unauthorized flight operations of nonparticipating aircraft within the temporary restricted areas during the hours they are activated.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before December 13, 1978.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to:

Director, FAA Southwest Region, Attention: Chief, Air Traffic Division, Docket No. 78-SW-50, Federal Aviation Administration, P.O. Box 1689, Fort Worth, Tex. 76101.

Send comments on the environmental aspects to:

Department of the Air Force, Headquarters, Tactical Air Command (DEEV), Langley AFB, Va. 23665, telephone 804-764-4430.

The official docket may be examined at the following location:

FAA Office of the Chief Counsel, Rules Docket (AGC-24), Room 916, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20591.

An informal docket may be examined at the office of the Regional Air Traffic Division.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Lewis W. Still, Airspace Regulations Branch (AAT-230), Airspace and Air Traffic Rules Division, Air Traffic Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20591; telephone 202-426-8525.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

COMMENTS INVITED

Interested persons may participate in the proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the airspace docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the Director, Southwest Region, Attention: Chief, Air Traffic Division, Federal Aviation Administration, P.O. Box 1689, Fort Worth, Tex. 76101. All communications received on or before December 13, 1978, will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendments. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons.